arXiv:hep-ph/0611363v1 29 Nov 2006

Higgs Fields as Vielbeins of Internal Symmetry Space

CHAN Hong-Mo
h.m.chan @ rl.ac.uk
Rutherford Appleton Laboratory,
Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom

TSOU Sheung Tsun
tsou @ maths.ox.ac.uk
Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford,
24-29 St. Giles', Oxford, OX1 3LB, United Kingdom

Abstract

An earlier suggestion that scalar fields in gauge theory may be introduced as frame vectors or vielbeins in internal symmetry space, and so endowed with geometric significance, is here sharpened and refined. Applied to a $u(1) \times su(2)$ theory this gives exactly the Higgs structure of the standard electroweak theory. Applied to an $su(3)$ theory, it gives a structure having much in common with a phenomenological model previously constructed to explain fermion mixing and mass hierarchy. The difference in physical outcome for the two theories is here traced to the difference in structure between the two symmetry groups.

1 Introduction

Scalar fields as introduced by Higgs [1] and Kibble [2] to break gauge symmetries have become an essential feature of almost all present day particle theories, in particular the current Standard Model which has great success in correlating existing data. They are still however a bit of an enigma because, apart from the fact that the associated bosons have not yet been experimentally observed, they are not known theoretically, in stark contrast to the vector gauge fields, to have any geometrical significance, which is, to say the least, surprising in a theory otherwise so geometrically grounded. It is therefore of interest to explore various theoretical possibilities for assigning to these scalar fields a geometrical significance, in the hope of understanding better the fundamental structure of gauge theories and gaining some new physical insight.

In an earlier paper while constructing a phenomenological model for fermion generations [3, 4], it was suggested that Higgs scalars may conceivably be given the geometrical significance of frame vectors or "vielbeins" in internal symmetry space, much as the vierbeins familiar in the theory of relativity, but this suggestion has neither been very precisely stated nor yet been vigorously pursued. It is our purpose in this paper to take the proposal further by first clarifying the basic concepts in a more general context and then exploring the possible physical consequences.

The considerations so developed are then applied in a companion paper [5] to the theory with local gauge symmetry $u(1) \times su(2) \times su(3)$ to deduce many of the properties of the Standard Model introduced as empirical inputs in the traditional formulation.

2 Frame Vectors as Field Variables

In gravity, one is used to having vierbeins as dynamical variables. It is thus reasonable, requiring no great stretch of imagination, to consider also in gauge theories the possibility of introducing frame vectors in internal symmetry space as dynamical variables. Let us first make clear what we mean by frame vectors in the gauge theory context, restricting ourselves for the moment to $su(N)$ symmetries.[1] A gauge theory is by definition invariant, of

[1]Here and throughout this paper, we denote a gauge symmetry by its gauge (Lie) algebra whenever there is no necessity to specify which among the locally isomorphic Lie groups is to be selected as the gauge group, so as to avoid questions of topology inessential

course, under x-dependent changes of the local frames in internal symmetry space. A local frame can be specified by giving its orientation with respect to some x-independent (global) reference frame, via a transformation matrix, say Ω, from the global to the local frame, thus:

$$\Omega = (\omega_a^{\tilde{a}}), \quad \Omega \in SU(N), \tag{1}$$

with $a = 1, 2, ..., N$ labelling the rows and $\tilde{a} = 1, 2, ..., N$ the columns, and it is the columns $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\tilde{a}}$ in Ω here we call the frame vectors. We note that while these (columns of Ω) transform under changes of the local frame as fundamental representations of $su(N)$, the rows of Ω on the other hand transform under changes of the (global) reference frames as anti-fundamental representations of the same algebra. There are thus two symmetries involved which we shall distinguish henceforth as $su(N)$ and $\widetilde{su}(N)$, with the first being the local one and the second the global one.

As matters stand, the frame vectors $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\tilde{a}}$ are all of unit length. To promote them into fields as suggested, we want to allow them the possibility of ranging over all complex values. This we interpret as embedding all of them, or in other words the matrix Ω, into a linear space and take the coordinates thereof as the actual field variables:

$$\Phi = (\phi_a^{\tilde{a}}). \tag{2}$$

There are of course many ways that one can do so. The simplest is just to take the elements $\omega_a^{\tilde{a}}$ of Ω themselves, but releasing them from all the unitarity constraints that they originally satisfy so that each can now range independently over all complex values. This means embedding Ω in $\mathbb{C}^{N^2}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{2N^2}$.

For the case of the symmetry $su(2)$, however, this simple embedding into $\mathbb{R}^8$ is clearly much too extravagant. For $su(N)$ symmetries, the matrix Ω forms a faithful representation of the group $SU(N)$, so that embedding Ω is the same as embedding the group itself into a linear space, and $SU(2)$, being topologically a 3-sphere S^3, can be embedded already in $\mathbb{R}^4$. In the above language, this means releasing Ω not from all the unitarity constraints it satisfies, but only from the condition that, say, its column vectors $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{r}}$ be of unit length while keeping the condition that they should be mutually orthogonal and of the same length, thus explicitly:

$$\phi_r^{\tilde{2}} = -\epsilon_{rs}(\phi_s^{\tilde{1}})^*. \tag{3}$$

for the problem in hand. By convention, lower case letters denote algebras and upper case letters groups.

This still allows each component to range over all complex values, though no longer independently, and hence still to qualify as field variables as above perceived. That being the case, we need introduce only one of the two vectors $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1},\tilde{2}}$ as field variable, the other will be given by the condition (3), or in other words that we have embedded Ω into $\mathbb{R}^4$ as anticipated, which is in fact the minimal embedding for $SU(2)$.

We note that a similar embedding is not available to $SU(3)$, for example. One could here of course also reduce the dimension of the embedding space by insisting that the vector $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{3}}$, say, be always orthogonal to the vectors $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}}$:

$$\phi^{\tilde{3}}_r = \epsilon_{rst}(\phi^{\tilde{1}}_s)^*(\phi^{\tilde{2}}_t)^*, \tag{4}$$

but this relation is inhomogeneous, implying that $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{3}}$ would have a different physical dimension from that of $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}}$, a condition that we cannot physically accept. The best that we can do, it seems, is just to retain from the unitarity constraints the condition that the determinant be real. When cast in the form:

$$\det \Phi = (\det \Phi)^*, \tag{5}$$

the condition is homogeneous, thus not suffering from the same objection against (4) above, and multilinear, thus allowing the independent variables to achieve all complex values as demanded. While retaining this among all the unitarity constraints on Ω reduces the dimension only by 1 from that of the simple embedding, it seems to be for $su(3)$ already the smallest that is physically admissible. Similar considerations apply to all $su(N),\ N \geq 3$.

The smaller the embedding means the smaller the number of scalar fields that have to be introduced. For reasons of economy, therefore, it seems to us reasonable to choose, if possible, the smallest embedding when promoting frame vectors into fields, and we shall do so. The difference in the minimal embedding noted above between $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ will then, as we shall see, play a significant role in the present framework in giving the very different physics emerging from the electroweak theory on the one hand and from QCD on the other.

The field variables $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}$ so introduced, whether obtained in the general $SU(N)$ or in the special $SU(2)$ case from "minimal" embedding, transform in the same way under gauge transformations as the frame vectors $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\tilde{a}}$, i.e. as the fundamental representation of the gauge symmetry, but under Lorentz transformations they are space-time scalars. In other words, by promoting the frame vectors in the internal symmetry space into dynamical variables

(which we shall refer to henceforth as "framons" to avoid confusion) we have already smuggled into the gauge framework scalar fields with some properties of the Higgs fields we require.

3 The Invariant Action

We next proceed to construct an action for the framon fields so introduced. Apart from Lorentz invariance, we must require of course that the action be invariant under local gauge transformations of $su(N)$. Moreover, since physics should presumably also not be affected by the choice of the reference frame, it would seem that we should require the action to be also invariant under global transformations in $\widetilde{su}(N)$. Together, these invariance properties impose stringent restrictions on the actions one can construct. Indeed, one seems to be limited then only to actions of the following form:

$$\mathcal{A} = -\frac{1}{4}\int \mathrm{Tr}\,(F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}) + \int \mathrm{Tr}\,((D_\mu\Phi)^\dagger(D^\mu\Phi)) + \int V[\Phi]. \tag{6}$$

The first term is the usual gauge field action which is of course invariant under local gauge transformations in $su(N)$, and also invariant trivially under global transformations in $\widetilde{su}(N)$ since on these it does not depend. The second term, which is the kinetic energy term of the Φ field, is invariant under local gauge transformation because of the covariant derivative D_μ defined as usual as:

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - igA_\mu, \tag{7}$$

with A_μ being the gauge potential corresponding to $F_{\mu\nu}$, but also under global transformation under $\widetilde{su}(N)$ because of the trace which is actually taken over $\tilde{a}$ indices. The third term is the potential $V[\Phi]$ representing the self-interaction of the Φ scalar fields, which, because of the required invariance, is limited to the following form up to fourth order (for renormalizability):

$$V[\Phi] = -\mu\ \mathrm{Tr}\,(\Phi^\dagger\Phi) + \lambda\ \left(\mathrm{Tr}\,(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)\right)^2 + \kappa\ \mathrm{Tr}\,(\Phi^\dagger\Phi\Phi^\dagger\Phi)\,, \tag{8}$$

and depends on only three real parameters, μ, λ, κ. The signs of these parameters have no meaning at present but are labelled such only in anticipation of future application.

For the special case of $su(2)$, if we choose the minimal embedding, i.e. insist on the orthogonality condition (3) being satisfied, one of the two doublets

$\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1},\tilde{2}}$ can be eliminated, leaving only say $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}} = \boldsymbol{\phi}$ as variable. A straightforward calculation then shows that the action in (6) reduces to just:

$$\mathcal{A} = -\frac{1}{4}\int \mathrm{Tr}\,(F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}) + 2\int (D_\mu\boldsymbol{\phi})^\dagger(D^\mu\boldsymbol{\phi}) + \int V^{MH}[\boldsymbol{\phi}] \tag{9}$$

where we notice that the framon potential $V[\Phi]$ reduces to the familiar Mexican hat potential:

$$V^{MH}[\boldsymbol{\phi}] = -\mu'|\boldsymbol{\phi}|^2 + \lambda'(|\boldsymbol{\phi}|^2)^2, \tag{10}$$

with $\mu' = 2\mu,\ \lambda' = 4\lambda + 2\kappa$. Alternatively, there being really only one independent doublet of framon fields, one can choose to start with only say $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}} = \boldsymbol{\phi}$ as variable to construct an action invariant under local $su(2)$ transformations getting directly (9) as the result. The potential $V^{MH}[\Phi]$ depends only on the length of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ (a column vector of Φ), which however, by (3), is the same as the length of the rows of Φ and is therefore automatically invariant under $\widetilde{su}(2)$ also. Or, equivalently, $|\boldsymbol{\phi}|^2 = (\mathrm{Re}(\phi_1))^2 + (\mathrm{Im}(\phi_1))^2 + (\mathrm{Re}(\phi_2))^2 + (\mathrm{Im}(\phi_2))^2$ is seen to be invariant under $so(4)$ which is the same as $su(2) \times \widetilde{su}(2)$.

4 Confinement Picture of Symmetry Breaking

The action (9) with the parameters μ', λ' in V^{MH} both positive is often given as an example of a theory with a local $su(2)$ symmetry which is spontaneously broken. However, as first pointed out by 't Hooft [6] and by Banks and Rabinovici [7], and re-emphasized recently by 't Hooft [8], it can equally be interpreted as a theory in which the local $su(2)$ symmetry confines and remains exact. In this confinement picture, what appear as particles observable by experiment, such as the Higgs boson and the massive vector bosons (and eventually also the leptons and quarks when fermions are introduced), are all $su(2)$ singlets, being compound states, bound or confined by the $su(2)$ symmetry, of the fundamental scalar, i.e. "framon", fields $\phi_r^{\tilde{r}}$ with their own conjugates, with the gauge fields (or with some fundamental fermion fields yet to be introduced). So long as one assumes, however, as the cited authors did, that the confinement by $su(2)$ is very deep, much deeper, say, than the confinement by colour, so as to be inaccessible by present experiment, then these particles will appear as elementary, giving in present usage the same

result in practical terms as the conventional picture of symmetry breaking. Some may find, as we do, the confinement picture physically more appealing, which is in any case more convenient to use in certain circumstances than the conventional interpretation.

As originally formulated, the confinement picture does not depend of course on the framon idea suggested here. However, to realise the picture starting from (9), one relies first on the introduction via (3) of the subsidiary fields $\phi_r^{\tilde{2}}$ with the original fields $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ in (9) taken as $\phi_r^{\tilde{1}}$, and secondly on the existence of an $\widetilde{su}(2)$ symmetry in the Mexican hat potential as explained at the end of the last section. Neither of these concepts were there originally in the conventional construction of (9) as an action locally invariant under $su(2)$ of the single scalar field $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, and may thus appear as somewhat incidental. On the other hand, starting with the framon idea proposed above, both the $\widetilde{su}(2)$ symmetry and the fields $\phi_r^{\tilde{r}}$ were there at the onset and would thus appear, together with the confinement picture, to be more natural. Moreover, they have both their parallels in other $su(N)$ theories, which then suggest how the confinement picture can be generalized to these theories, a subject that will be taken up again later. For future reference, therefore, we shall recast in the rest of this section the arguments of 't Hooft [6, 8] and Banks and Rabinovici [7] for the $su(2)$ theory in the language of the framon proposal.

Let us start then with the invariant action for framons of (6), specialized in the case of present interest to $su(2)$. This being by construction invariant under local $su(2)$, we can choose to work in the gauge where $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}}$ points in the up direction and is real, the 3 degrees of freedom in $su(2)$ being just sufficient for this to be done. The minimal embedding condition (3) then implies that $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}}$ would point in the down direction, is real also and has the same length. In other words, we have, by a gauge transformation Ω_0:

$$\Phi = \Omega_0 \Phi_0 = \Omega_0 \begin{pmatrix} \rho & 0 \\ 0 & \rho \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

with ρ real and Φ_0 diagonal. Recalling now the geometric meaning of Φ as the transformation matrix from the local to the global reference frame, we see that for Ω_0 as for Φ, the rows refer to the local frame but the columns to the global reference frame. It is the transformation which rotates the local frame vectors so as to be aligned to the global reference frame vectors. We can call this the "locked gauge" in which the local and global frames are locked together in direction.

Under the gauge transformation Ω_0, we have as usual:

$$A_\mu \longrightarrow \tilde{A}_\mu = \frac{i}{g}\,\Omega_0^\dagger D_\mu \Omega_0, \tag{12}$$

$$D_\mu \Phi = \Omega_0(\partial_\mu - ig\tilde{A}_\mu)\Phi_0. \tag{13}$$

The action (6) being invariant by construction will remain of the same form with just Φ replaced by Φ_0 and A_μ replaced by $\tilde{A}_\mu$. But this is exactly the same as the action one would obtain in the symmetry breaking picture by choosing the vacuum to be such as to have $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}}$ pointing in the up direction and be real, except for the replacement of A_μ by $\tilde{A}_\mu$.

Alternatively one can, so as to be on more familiar grounds, eliminate $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}}$ via (3) from consideration, reducing the action from (6) to (9). The gauge transformation (12) on the reduced action gives then the standard $su(2)$ action in the symmetry breaking picture when the vacuum is chosen to have the one remaining scalar doublet real and pointing in the up direction, but again with A_μ replaced by $\tilde{A}_\mu$.

In either case, since the actions are formally the same, one would obtain the same result, say in perturbation expansion, provided that $\tilde{A}_\mu$ can be interpreted as a point particle. What does this $\tilde{A}_\mu$ field represent? We note from (12), recalling that Ω_0 carries $su(2)$ indices only on its left, that $\tilde{A}_\mu$ has no unsaturated $su(2)$ indices, i.e. it is an $su(2)$ singlet. To see what it represents, let us expand ρ about its vacuum value, thus $\rho = F + h_1$, with $F = \sqrt{\mu'/2\lambda'}$ being the minimum of the Mexican hat potential, obtaining for Φ_0:

$$\Phi_0 = \begin{pmatrix} F + h_1 & 0 \\ 0 & F + h_1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

and hence

$$\Phi^\dagger D_\mu \Phi = -igF^2 \tilde{A}_\mu + O(h_1/F). \tag{15}$$

One sees then that $\tilde{A}_\mu$ can be interpreted to leading order in the expansion as a p-wave bound state of Φ with it conjugate $\Phi^\dagger$ obtained by $su(2)$ confinement. Similarly, from:

$$\Phi^\dagger \Phi = F^2 + 2Fh_1 + O(h_1/F). \tag{16}$$

one sees that the Higgs boson h_1 is to be interpreted as an s-wave bound state of Φ with $\Phi^\dagger$. Thus one has obtained the same results in the confinement picture as in the symmetry breaking picture, only with a different interpretation for the Higgs and vector particles as bound states in $su(2)$ confinement.

5 The Electroweak Theory

We now turn to an actual physical situation and consider the electroweak theory. Let us pretend for the moment that one has never heard before of the theory and ask, when faced with a theory with gauge symmetry $u(1) \times su(2)$, how one would implement the idea of having frame vectors introduced as fields, as was done before for $su(N)$.

Suppose then we are given a gauge theory with gauge potentials a_μ in $u(1)$ and $A_\mu = A^i_\mu \tau_i/2$ in $su(2)$, and the standard field action:

$$\mathcal{A}_F = -\frac{1}{4}\int d^4x f_{\mu\nu} f^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}\int d^4x \,\mathrm{Tr}\,(F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}) \tag{17}$$

with

$$f_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\nu a_\mu - \partial_\mu a_\nu, \tag{18}$$

and

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\nu A_\mu - \partial_\mu A_\nu + i g_2 [A_\mu, A_\nu], \tag{19}$$

and that we are required, by our proposed criterion, to introduce as field variables, in addition to a_μ and A_μ, also the frame vectors in the internal symmetry space. What should these be in the present case when the symmetry is not simple as in the $su(N)$ cases previously considered, but is instead a product symmetry $u(1) \times su(2)$?

Let us first see what would be the analogue of frame vectors in a $u(1)$ theory. Frame vectors are there to specify the orientation of the local frame relative to some global reference frame. For the $u(1)$ theory, orientation means just a phase, and relative orientation just the phase difference, thus:

$$\omega = e^{i g_1 (\alpha - \tilde{\alpha})}, \tag{20}$$

where α can depend on x but $\tilde{\alpha}$ is x-independent. We have here taken for granted that the gauge group is compact, i.e. a $U(1)$ with "size" $2\pi/g_1$. Under a local change of frame, the frame vector ω transforms by a $u(1)$ transformation effected by multiplication by say $\exp i g_1 \delta\alpha$, and, under a global change of reference frame, by a $\tilde{u}(1)$ transformation effected by multiplication by $\exp -i g_1 \delta\tilde{\alpha}$.

That being the case, what would a frame vector be for the product symmetry $u(1) \times su(2)$? It would have to be a representation of the algebra $u(1) \times su(2)$ to be constructed out of the representations of $u(1)$ and $su(2)$ for respectively the frame vectors of the component symmetries. One can

in principle take either the sum or the product representation. We propose to take the product, this being the smaller of the two: $1 + 2 > 1 \times 2$. The smaller the representation for the local group means the smaller the number of x-dependent scalar fields that one has eventually to introduce for framons. Thus choosing the smaller representation here is the same in purpose as insisting on the minimal embedding above to economize on the number of scalar fields. With the choice of the product representation, a frame vector of the $u(1) \times su(2)$ theory will then appear as a 2-vector:

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{21}$$

which transforms as a doublet under local $su(2)$ and carries at the same time a $u(1)$ charge.

What $u(1)$ charge should $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ carry? The analogue in $u(1)$ for the doublet in $su(2)$ as the fundamental representation we interpret as the representation with the minimal quantized charge. The value of the minimal charge depends on what is taken as the gauge group of the theory. So far only the gauge algebra is specified as $u(1)\times su(2)$, but several groups share the same algebra: $U(1) \times SU(2)$, $U(1) \times SO(3)$, $U(2)$, where $U(1) \times SO(3)$ has no doublet representations and can be discarded right away for our present consideration. Of the remaining 2 groups, $U(1)\times SU(2)$ double covers $U(2)$ so that the latter can be considered the smaller. Let us choose then the latter, true to the spirit of economy maintained throughout, although in this case the choice of gauge group, in contrast to the choice of representations and of embeddings above, does not affect the number of scalar fields that have to be introduced. With $U(2)$ as gauge group, the minimal quantized $u(1)$ charge is $g_1/2$ [9], and one obtains for the frame vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ the $u(1)$ charge $\pm g_1/2$, where the ambiguity in sign is due to the fundamental representation $\mathbf{2}$ and the antifundamental representation $\bar{\mathbf{2}}$ of $su(2)$ being equivalent.

The actual phase of the frame vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ depends also on the global reference phase, i.e. the reference frame for the $u(1)$ symmetry, and will change under a change of this phase. In other words, $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ would be assigned a $\tilde{u}(1)$ charge also, which as explained in an earlier paragraph would have a value opposite to that of the $u(1)$ charge. Thus under a $u(1)$ transformation represented by the phase change $\exp ig_1\delta\alpha$ or a $\tilde{u}(1)$ transformation represented by the phase change $\exp -ig_1\delta\tilde{\alpha}$, the frame vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ or equivalently the framon field $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ would transform as:

$$\boldsymbol{\phi} \xrightarrow{u(1)} e^{\pm ig_1\delta\alpha/2}\boldsymbol{\phi}; \quad \boldsymbol{\phi} \xrightarrow{\tilde{u}(1)} e^{\mp ig_1\delta\tilde{\alpha}/2}\boldsymbol{\phi}. \tag{22}$$

We need 2 such framons, say $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}}$ which, by minimal embedding, are to be related by (3). If given definite $u(1)$ and $\tilde{u}(1)$ charges as in (22), then their charges will have to be opposite. They can be taken as:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}} &= \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(-)}; \quad u(1) \text{ charge} = -\tfrac{1}{2}g_1; \quad \tilde{u}(1) \text{ charge} = \tfrac{1}{2}g_1, \\ \boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}} &= \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(+)}; \quad u(1) \text{ charge} = \tfrac{1}{2}g_1; \quad \tilde{u}(1) \text{ charge} = -\tfrac{1}{2}g_1, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

one of which can be eliminated by (3) in terms of the other as independent variable. This is not the most general choice, however, for neither basis framon need be an eigenstate of the $u(1)$ or the $\tilde{u}(1)$ charge. One can choose instead:

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}} = \alpha^{(-)}\boldsymbol{\phi}^{(-)} + \alpha^{(+)}\boldsymbol{\phi}^{(+)} \tag{24}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}} = -(\alpha^{(+)})^*\boldsymbol{\phi}^{(-)} + (\alpha^{(-)})^*\boldsymbol{\phi}^{(+)}, \tag{25}$$

with

$$|\alpha^{(-)}|^2 + |\alpha^{(+)}|^2 = 1. \tag{26}$$

i.e. effect an $\widetilde{su}(2)$ transformation on (23), and they would still satisfy the minimal embedding condition (3). However, the theory being supposed to be $\widetilde{su}(2)$ invariant, one can always choose to work in the $\widetilde{su}(2)$ gauge (global) where the basis framons are as in (23) above. Indeed, since the theory is also $su(2)$ invariant, one can also choose to work in the gauge when the local and global frames are aligned, in which case the framon matrix will be diagonal and symmetric between the dual (i.e. with and without tilde) symmetries, with the charge assignments:

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] & 0 \\ 0 & [\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}] \end{pmatrix}, \tag{27}$$

where the first number inside the square brackets denotes the $u(1)$ charge, and the second the $\tilde{u}(1)$ charge. However, to keep the invariance under $\widetilde{su}(2)$ explicit, it is often convenient to work with a general choice of $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}}$ which need not be eigenstates of the $u(1)$ or the $\tilde{u}(1)$ charge.

Having specified the framon fields to be introduced into the theory, our next task is to construct an action which is now required to be invariant locally under $u(1) \times su(2)$ and globally under $\tilde{u}(1) \times \widetilde{su}(2)$.

The gauge field action (17) we started with is by construction already invariant under local $u(1) \times su(2)$ transformations. It is also invariant trivially

under global $\tilde{u}(1) \times \widetilde{su}(2)$ transformations because on these it simply does not depend. It is thus already acceptable for our present theory.

Next, the potential (8) was constructed to be invariant under $su(2) \times \widetilde{su}(2)$. It is invariant also under $u(1)$ and $\tilde{u}(1)$ since the phases will just cancel. So we have in (8), or equivalently, when $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\bar{2}}$ is eliminated by the condition (3) in favour of $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\bar{1}} = \boldsymbol{\phi}$, the Mexican hat potential (10), already the potential with the invariance required.

This leaves only the kinetic energy term for the framon field, for which we notice that the corresponding second term in (6) would already suffice provided we replace the covariant derivative in (7) by:

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - igq\, a_\mu - ig_2 A_\mu, \tag{28}$$

with q the $u(1)$ charge operator, the resulting expression being then invariant under both local $u(1) \times su(2)$ and global $\tilde{u}(1) \times \widetilde{su}(2)$. In particular, in terms of the framons with definite $u(1)$ charges,

$$\mathcal{A}_{KE} = \int d^4x \, \left((D_\mu \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(+)})^\dagger (D^\mu \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(+)}) + (D_\mu \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(-)})^\dagger (D^\mu \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(-)}) \right) , \tag{29}$$

with

$$D_\mu \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(\pm)} = (\partial_\mu \mp i \frac{g_1}{2} a_\mu - i g_2 A_\mu) \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(\pm)}. \tag{30}$$

Further, a direct calculation in the gauge where $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{(\pm)}$ are real and point in the up (down) direction readily shows that, because of (3), the two terms in (29) are in fact identical and add up to just:

$$\mathcal{A}_{KE} = 2 \int d^4x (D_\mu \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(+)})^\dagger (D^\mu \boldsymbol{\phi}^{(+)}). \tag{31}$$

Together then for the bosonic sector, we have for the action of our $u(1) \times su(2)$ theory:

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_F + \mathcal{A}_{KE} + \int d^4x \, V^{MH}[\Phi], \tag{32}$$

which is the same as the standard electroweak action in the conventional formulation. It thus seems not only that the Higgs field of the electroweak theory can be interpreted as a frame vector in internal symmetry space as suggested, and hence be given a geometrical significance that it previously lacked, but that, starting with the assumption that frame vectors are to be introduced as dynamical variables as part of the gauge framework, one is

led, modulo arguments on minimality, uniquely to the standard electroweak action as the result.

The claim for uniqueness, however, should not be given undue significance. The framon idea as conceived at present is insufficient by itself to specify uniquely which scalar fields are to be introduced for product symmetries like $u(1) \times su(2)$. What one did then was to invoke what one might call the "principle of minimality" to resolve the ambiguities in the small number of choices available. This "principle" was invoked 3 times: first in the choice of embedding of the frame vectors in $\mathbb{R}^N$ to promote them into fields (in common with the case of the simple $su(2)$ theory), secondly in the choice of the product over the sum representation for $u(1) \times su(2)$, and thirdly in the choice of $U(2)$ as the gauge group. The first 2 economise on the number of scalar fields that have to be introduced, while the third economises on the number of admissible representations. But one has no good physical reason to give for why nature should opt for these economies. Besides, since one already knows the electroweak theory and hence the answer one wants, one could probably replace this "principle of minimality", if it did not work, by some other equally plausible criterion. Nevertheless, we find it interesting that an insistence on economy, which is undoubtedly a good thing, does lead us uniquely to the correct answer.

The action (32) with $\mu, \lambda > 0$ in V^{HM} is usually interpreted as representing a theory with its local $su(2)$ gauge symmetry spontaneously broken. But, as in the example of the preceding section, it can equivalently be interpreted as a theory in which the local $su(2)$ symmetry confines. This follows, as in the previous example, by rewriting the action in terms of the bound state fields $\tilde{A}_\mu$ and h_1, giving the same result as before for the first and third terms, but for the kinetic energy term $\mathcal{A}_{KE}$, one has instead:

$$\mathcal{A}_{KE} \sim F^2 \left(\left[\frac{g_1}{2} a_\mu + g_2 \tilde{A}_\mu \right]^2 \right)_{11} + (\partial_\mu h_1)^2, \tag{33}$$

where the first is the mass term for the vector bound states $\tilde{A}_\mu$ which can be rewritten in the familiar form:

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \tilde{A}^\alpha_\mu \tilde{A}^{\mu\beta} M_{\alpha\beta} \tag{34}$$

with $\tilde{A}^0_\mu = a_\mu$ and

$$M_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{F^2}{4}\begin{pmatrix} g_2^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_2^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_2^2 & g_2 g_1 \\ 0 & 0 & g_1 g_2 & g_1^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{35}$$

One recovers thus the familiar mixing between γ and Z except that there is now a difference in the interpretation. The mixing here is one between the $u(1)$ gauge boson with a neutral $su(2)$ singlet bound state of $\Phi^\dagger\Phi$, not with the $su(2)$ gauge field. There is thus no breaking of the local $su(2)$ gauge symmetry. What is broken is only the global symmetry $\widetilde{su}(2)$, and this by the $u(1)$ interaction which assigns to certain directions in $\widetilde{su}(2)$ a $u(1)$ charge of $\pm g_1/2$. This difference with the conventional formulation is already pertinent to the confinement picture, as noted e.g. by 't Hooft [8], and not special to the framon suggestion.

What is new, however, for the framon proposal, is the $\tilde{u}(1)$ invariance which made no appearance in the standard formulation of electroweak theory. Such a new invariance would lead to a new conserved (global) charge, and it is of interest to ask what physical significance it has, if any. Of particles so far considered, only the $W^\pm$ carry such a charge:

$$W^+_\mu = \boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}\dagger}(A^i_\mu \tau_i)\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}} \sim [1,-1], \tag{36}$$

$$W^-_\mu = \boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}\dagger}(A^i_\mu \tau_i)\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}} \sim [-1,1], \tag{37}$$

with γ, Z, H all having both $u(1)$ and $\tilde{u}(1)$ charges zero. Since the 2 charges are always equal in magnitude and opposite in sign, the conservation of the one will always imply the conservation of the other so that the $\tilde{u}(1)$ charge has so far no additional significance.

This is no longer true, however, when other particles are introduced which do not a priori carry both charges with opposite signs. This is the case with fermions, which have so far been left out of our consideration but is now of interest. Let us introduce as usual the left-handed fermion field ψ_L as an $su(2)$ doublet. Being of necessity a representation of the gauge group $U(2)$, it must then carry also a $u(1)$ charge $\pm g_1/2$, of which to follow the standard convention for leptons we take as $-g_1/2$. Like the gauge fields, this ψ field carries no $\tilde{u}(1)$ charge, since this charge arises only from the introduction of the global reference frame which affects only the framons. Further, being an $su(2)$ doublet, ψ_L cannot exist as a freely propagating

particle in the confinement picture. It can, however, form bound states by $su(2)$ confinement with the framon field Φ, thus in the "locked gauge" (27) where $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{(+)}$ is real and points in the up direction:

$$\Phi\psi_L = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e^- \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} [0, -\frac{1}{2}] \\ [-1, \frac{1}{2}] \end{pmatrix}, \tag{38}$$

where, following 't Hooft [6, 8] and Banks and Rabinovici [7], we have identified the bound states as left-handed leptons. In (38), as before, the first number inside the square bracket denotes the $u(1)$ and the second the $\tilde{u}(1)$ charge. We notice now that the $\tilde{u}(1)$ charge is no longer equal in magnitude and opposite in sign to the $u(1)$ charge as it was for the bosons, but is shifted from $-q$, the $u(1)$ charge, by an amount $-L/2$; thus

$$\tilde{q} = -q - L/2, \tag{39}$$

where we may identify L as the lepton number. Hence the invariance of the theory under both $u(1)$ and $\tilde{u}(1)$ gives as consequence the conservation of lepton number as well as that of the electric charge. This prediction of the conservation of lepton number by the framon proposal is of no great interest when restricted to the simple electroweak theory, since lepton number conservation there is in any case implied by fermion number conservation. But it will take on a new significance when the theory is extended to include quarks in the strong sector, leading to $B-L$ conservation, as will be reported in a companion paper [5].

6 "Chromodynamics"

By "chromodynamics" we mean here the gauge theory with gauge symmetry $su(3)$ which forms the basis of the current theory of strong interactions without implying as yet that in the way we handle it here it will be a realistic template for such a theory. And we shall consider it for now in isolation without taking into account the electroweak theory to which we know it is intimately coupled in nature. When considered as a theory of strong interactions, the $su(3)$ theory is believed to be confining and as such, in the conventional conception, does not require any scalar fields, as the electroweak theory does, for symmetry breaking. However, now that we propose that scalar fields play in gauge theories the role of frame vectors in internal symmetry space, it would seem more natural to introduce them in this theory

as well. Besides, as indicated in section 4 above, the fact that a theory is confining does not in itself preclude the possibility that it shares some properties of a broken symmetry. Rather, if we were to introduce into the theory the framon scalar fields as suggested, then colour $su(3)$ confinement would bring with it a broken global $\widetilde{su}(3)$ symmetry, which indeed may not be so unwelcome as a possible candidate for the three-fold symmetry of fermion generations, as suggested in [3, 4]. In any case, it would be interesting, as we now propose to do, to consider this as a possibility.

Let us then introduce as framon fields the elements of the matrix Φ:

$$\Phi = (\phi_a^{\tilde{a}}), \quad a = 1, 2, 3; \quad \tilde{a} = 1, 2, 3. \tag{40}$$

Apart from requiring the determinant to be real, as explained in section 2, we allow the different $\phi_a^{\tilde{a}}$ to vary independently over all complex values. Next, we construct an action in accordance with the criterion suggested there obtaining (6) and (8) as the result.

Our first task is to examine the potential (8) to elucidate its properties. For the case of $su(3)$, the potential can be conveniently rewritten in terms of the 3-vectors in colour space $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}$, with $\tilde{a} = 1, 2, 3$, thus:

$$V[\Phi] = -\mu \sum_{\tilde{a}} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}|^2 + \lambda \left(\sum_{\tilde{a}} |\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}|^2 \right)^2 + \kappa \sum_{\tilde{a},\tilde{b}} |(\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{b}})|^2, \tag{41}$$

And it is instructive, at least for us, to examine it in comparison with the potential:

$$V_{DSM}[\Phi] = V[\Phi] - \kappa \sum_{\tilde{a}} |\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}|^4, \tag{42}$$

differing from it only in that in the κ term, the sum is taken in V_{DSM} not over all $\tilde{a}$ and $\tilde{b}$ but over only $\tilde{a} \neq \tilde{b}$. The latter potential V_{DSM}, which is not invariant under $\widetilde{su}(3)$ as required here, was previously used by us in a phenomenological model [3, 10, 11, 4] (which we call the Dualized Standard Model (DSM)) quite successfully, we think, to explain the fermion mass hierarchy and mixing patterns.

First, let us summarize briefly the properties of the potential V_{DSM} a slight modification of which will apply to the framon potential V of real interest to us here. In V_{DSM}, only the κ term depends on the relative orientations of the vectors $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}$. Hence, for $\kappa > 0$, the minimum of the potential occurs when these vectors are mutually orthogonal. In that case, the potential reduces back to the Mexican hat potential (10), only now with the

argument $|\boldsymbol{\phi}|$ replaced by

$$\zeta = \sqrt{\sum_{\tilde{a}} |\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}|^2}\,. \tag{43}$$

This yields as usual the minimum at

$$\zeta = \sqrt{\mu/(2\lambda)}, \tag{44}$$

independently of how ζ is distributed among the 3 $|\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}|$'s. In other words, if we write $|\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}|$ for $\tilde{a} = 1, 2, 3$ as a 3-vector, thus

$$(|\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{1}}|, |\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{2}}|, |\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{3}}|) = \zeta(x, y, z), \tag{45}$$

with

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1, \tag{46}$$

the minimum of V_{DSM} is degenerate with respect to the direction of the vector (x, y, z) in 3-space, or that V_{DSM} has a trough or valley in xyz-space with a flat bottom at a constant radius given by (44).

What happens with the framon potential in (41) of present interest? A straightforward analysis gives that because of the term additional to V_{DSM} as exhibited in (42), the minimum will now lose its degeneracy in the direction of the vector in (45) and settles at the symmetric point $(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(1, 1, 1)$. The valley or trough found in V_{DSM} is distorted by the extra term in the framon potential so as to lose both its flat bottom and its constant radius. Thus, if we were to start at the stationary (saddle) point at $(x, y, z) = (1, 0, 0)$ with $\zeta = \sqrt{\mu/2(\lambda + \kappa)}$, it will roll down the trough with changing (x, y, z) and changing radius $\zeta = \sqrt{\mu/(2[\lambda + \kappa(x^4 + y^4 + z^4)])}$ until it reaches the true minimum at $(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(1, 1, 1)$.

Next, we need to examine the Higgs boson spectrum. We shall do so in the confinement picture described in section 4. Following the logic outlined therein, we first fix the gauge of the local $su(3)$ symmetry by acting on the framon field Φ from the left by an $su(3)$ transformation rotating Φ into a canonical form which we take to be the triangular form, thus:

$$\Phi_F = \begin{pmatrix} H_1^{\tilde{1}} & \eta_1^{\tilde{2}} & \eta_1^{\tilde{3}} \\ 0 & H_2^{\tilde{2}} & \eta_2^{\tilde{3}} \\ 0 & 0 & H_3^{\tilde{3}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{47}$$

with $H_a^{\tilde{a}}$ real and $\eta_b^{\tilde{a}}$ complex, the 8 degrees of freedom in $su(3)$ being just sufficient to do so for Φ (in the "minimal" embedding with determinant real).

First, for the potential V_{DSM}, the minimum is degenerate and occurs in this gauge when Φ is diagonal,

$$\Phi_0 = \zeta \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \end{pmatrix}. \tag{48}$$

Hence, we can rewrite Φ as;

$$\Phi_F = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta x + h_1^{\tilde{1}} & \eta_1^{\tilde{2}} & \eta_1^{\tilde{3}} \\ 0 & \zeta y + h_2^{\tilde{2}} & \eta_2^{\tilde{3}} \\ 0 & 0 & \zeta z + h_3^{\tilde{3}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{49}$$

with $h_a^{\tilde{a}}$ real and $\eta_b^{\tilde{a}}$ complex being the small fluctuations about the minimum, which are to represent the Higgs degrees of freedom. One sees thus immediately that there are to be 9 Higgs bosons in this scheme.

In the confinement picture, the Higgs bosons are to be considered as bound states $\Phi^\dagger\Phi$ confined by $su(3)$. To find their spectrum, we need to evaluate V_{DSM} in the triangular gauge to second order in the fluctuations $h_a^{\tilde{a}}$ and $\eta_b^{\tilde{a}}$. We obtain straightforwardly, on putting $\mu = 2\lambda\zeta^2$:

$$V_{DSM}[\Phi] \sim -\lambda\zeta^4 + 4\lambda\zeta^2(xh_1^{\tilde{1}} + yh_2^{\tilde{2}} + zh_3^{\tilde{3}})^2 + 2\kappa\zeta^2(x^2|\eta_1^{\tilde{2}}|^2 + x^2|\eta_1^{\tilde{3}}|^2 + y^2|\eta_2^{\tilde{3}}|^2). \tag{50}$$

From this, we can read off the 7 massive eigenstates of the Higgs boson as the combination $(xh_1^{\tilde{1}} + yh_2^{\tilde{2}} + zh_3^{\tilde{3}})$ plus the real and imaginary parts of $\eta_1^{\tilde{2}}, \eta_1^{\tilde{3}}$ and $\eta_2^{\tilde{3}}$.

To find the normalized eigenstates and hence the mass eigenvalues, we have to make explicit the unitary transformation between the gauge when Φ is triangular and the gauge when the minimum remains diagonal whatever the fluctuations, i.e.

$$\Omega_{DF}\Phi_D = \Phi_F, \tag{51}$$

where Φ_F is as given in (49) and Φ_D appears as:

$$\Phi_D = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta x + \delta\phi_1^{\tilde{1}} & \delta\phi_1^{\tilde{2}} & \delta\phi_1^{\tilde{3}} \\ \delta\phi_2^{\tilde{1}} & \zeta y + \delta\phi_2^{\tilde{2}} & \delta\phi_2^{\tilde{3}} \\ \delta\phi_3^{\tilde{1}} & \delta\phi_3^{\tilde{2}} & \zeta z + \delta\phi_3^{\tilde{3}} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{52}$$

To first order in the fluctuations, Ω_{DF}, which of course differs from the identity only to that order, reads as:

$$\Omega_{DF} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - i(\zeta x)^{-1}\delta\phi_{1I}^{\tilde{1}} & (\zeta x)^{-1}\delta\phi_{2}^{\tilde{1}*} & (\zeta x)^{-1}\delta\phi_{3}^{\tilde{1}*} \\ -(\zeta x)^{-1}\delta\phi_{2}^{\tilde{1}} & 1 - i(\zeta y)^{-1}\delta\phi_{2I}^{\tilde{2}} & (\zeta y)^{-1}\delta\phi_{3}^{\tilde{2}*} \\ -(\zeta x)^{-1}\delta\phi_{3}^{\tilde{1}} & -(\zeta y)^{-1}\delta\phi_{3}^{\tilde{2}} & 1 - i(\zeta z)^{-1}\delta\phi_{3I}^{\tilde{3}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (53)$$

where subscripts R and I denote the real and imaginary parts.

From (51), it follows then that:

$$\begin{aligned} h_1^{\tilde{1}} &= \delta\phi_{1R}^{\tilde{1}}; \quad h_2^{\tilde{2}} = \delta\phi_{2R}^{\tilde{2}}; \quad h_3^{\tilde{3}} = \delta\phi_{3R}^{\tilde{3}}; \\ \eta_1^{\tilde{2}} &= \delta\phi_1^{\tilde{2}} + \frac{y}{x}\delta\phi_2^{\tilde{1}*}; \\ \eta_1^{\tilde{3}} &= \delta\phi_1^{\tilde{3}} + \frac{z}{x}\delta\phi_3^{\tilde{1}*}; \\ \eta_2^{\tilde{3}} &= \delta\phi_2^{\tilde{3}} + \frac{z}{y}\delta\phi_3^{\tilde{2}*}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

This gives the normalized Higgs mass eigenstates as:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= xh_1^{\tilde{1}} + yh_2^{\tilde{2}} + zh_3^{\tilde{3}} = x\delta\phi_{1R}^{\tilde{1}} + y\delta\phi_{2R}^{\tilde{2}} + z\delta\phi_{3R}^{\tilde{3}} \\ H_2 &= \frac{y}{\sqrt{y^2+z^2}}\eta_{2R}^{\tilde{3}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{y^2+z^2}}(y\delta\phi_{2R}^{\tilde{3}} + z\delta\phi_{3R}^{\tilde{2}}) \\ H_3 &= \frac{y}{\sqrt{y^2+z^2}}\eta_{2I}^{\tilde{3}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{y^2+z^2}}(y\delta\phi_{2I}^{\tilde{3}} - z\delta\phi_{3I}^{\tilde{2}}) \\ H_4 &= \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2+z^2}}\eta_{1R}^{\tilde{3}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2+z^2}}(x\delta\phi_{1R}^{\tilde{3}} + z\delta\phi_{3R}^{\tilde{1}}) \\ H_5 &= \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2+z^2}}\eta_{1I}^{\tilde{3}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2+z^2}}(x\delta\phi_{1I}^{\tilde{3}} - z\delta\phi_{3I}^{\tilde{1}}) \\ H_6 &= \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}\eta_{1R}^{\tilde{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}(x\delta\phi_{1R}^{\tilde{2}} + y\delta\phi_{2R}^{\tilde{1}}) \\ H_7 &= \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}\eta_{1I}^{\tilde{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}(x\delta\phi_{1I}^{\tilde{2}} - y\delta\phi_{2I}^{\tilde{1}}), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

with eigenvalues read off from (50) as $4\lambda\zeta^2$ for H_1, $2\kappa\zeta^2(y^2+z^2)$ for H_2, H_3, $2\kappa\zeta^2(x^2+z^2)$ for H_4, H_5, and $2\kappa\zeta^2(x^2+y^2)$ for H_6, H_7. Further there are 2 zero modes, say $H_K, K = 8, 9$ which are linear combinations of $h_1^{\tilde{1}}, h_2^{\tilde{2}}, h_3^{\tilde{3}}$ orthogonal to H_1. These results are identical, as they should be, to those

obtained earlier in [10] with the potential (42) using the symmetry breaking picture.

But what happens for the framon potential (41) of actual interest? Following the same procedure, we first evaluate the potential for Φ in the canonical (triangular) gauge (47) up to second order in the fluctuations about the point (x, y, z)) as above, obtaining:

$$\begin{aligned} V[\Phi] \;\sim\; & -\zeta^4[\lambda+\kappa(x^4+y^4+z^4)] \\ & +4\kappa\zeta^3[(x^3h_1^{\tilde{1}}+y^3h_2^{\tilde{2}}+z^3h_3^{\tilde{3}})-(x^4+y^4+z^4)(xh_1^{\tilde{1}}+yh_2^{\tilde{2}}+zh_3^{\tilde{3}})] \\ & +4\lambda\zeta^2(xh_1^{\tilde{1}}+yh_2^{\tilde{2}}+zh_3^{\tilde{3}})^2 \\ & +2\kappa\zeta^2[3(x^2h_1^{\tilde{1}2}+y^2h_2^{\tilde{2}2}+z^2h_3^{\tilde{3}2})-(x^4+y^4+z^4)(h_1^{\tilde{1}2}+h_2^{\tilde{2}2}+h_3^{\tilde{3}2})] \\ & +2\kappa\zeta^2[(x^2+y^2)|\eta_1^{\tilde{2}}|^2+(x^2+z^2)|\eta_1^{\tilde{3}}|^2+(y^2+z^2)|\eta_2^{\tilde{3}}|^2 \\ & -(x^4+y^4+z^4)(|\eta_1^{\tilde{2}}|^2+|\eta_1^{\tilde{3}}|^2+|\eta_2^{\tilde{3}}|^2)] \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

We notice that V in (56), though more complicated, is still diagonal in the fluctuations $\eta_b^{\tilde{a}}$, which therefore remain mass eigenstates; indeed, since the transformation Ω_{DF} above and the subsequent arguments with it being independent of the potential, so will $H_K; K = 2, 3, ..., 7$ remain the normalized ones. Only in the subspace spanned by $h_1^{\tilde{1}}, h_2^{\tilde{2}}$ and $h_3^{\tilde{3}}$, the eigenstates are here no longer easy to identify, although, of course, they remain a triad of orthonormal linear combinations of H_1 and the 2 zero modes orthogonal to it. For the purpose of the present paper, we do not need to specify further the actual linear combinations which occur, nor yet their eigenvalues, except to note that the previous zero modes would now acquire in general nonzero masses.

The reason that we have gone to some detail in specifying the Higgs mass eigenstates for the framon potential V in comparison with those of the potential V_{DSM}, is that the latter have been instrumental in deriving a crucial feature in DSM [3, 10, 11, 4], namely a fermion mass matrix which rotates with changing energy scale, which leads to a simple, yet quite successful, explanation for the fermion mass hierarchy and mixing patterns seen in nature. The way that it works may be briefly summarized in our present language as follows. One starts, for reasons which need not be repeated here, with a Yukawa coupling term of the form:

$$\sum_{\tilde{a}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_L \boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}} \sum_{[b]} Y_{[b]} \psi_R^{[b]} + \text{h.c.}, \tag{57}$$

where left-handed fermion field $\boldsymbol{\psi}_L$ is an $su(3)$ triplet and the right-handed

fields $\psi_R^{[b]}$ are $su(3)$ singlets, coupled to the framon fields $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}$ via the Yukawa couplings $Y_{[b]}$. This gives at tree level a factorized fermion mass matrix, which by a relabelling of the right-handed fermion fields, can be written in a hermitian form without γ_5 as:

$$m \sim m_T \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} (x, y, z), \tag{58}$$

with (x, y, z) having the same meaning as in (45). This mass matrix, being of rank one, has only one nonzero eigenvalue with eigenvector (x, y, z). Besides, this eigenvector being the same for all fermion species, i.e. whether up or down type quarks, or charged leptons or neutrinos, the CKM and MNS mixing matrices are both the identity, and is thus not bad as a zeroth order approximation to reality, given the observed hierarchical masses and small mixing angles, the latter at least for quarks. When one turns on the loop corrections, however, the matrix m remains factorized, but the factor (x, y, z) now changes its orientation (rotates) with changing scale. This causes the mass in the heavy generation to "leak" into the 2 lower generations giving them small but nonzero masses, hence the observed mass hierarchy. At the same time, the state vectors of the up and down states lose their mutual alignment at tree level and acquire thereby a nontrivial mixing matrix between them. Furthermore, the rotation is found to have a fixed point at infinite energy at $(x, y, z) = (1, 0, 0)$ and another at zero energy at $(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(1, 1, 1)$, which offers an immediate qualitative explanation for some well-known but at first sight puzzling patterns in the measured mass and mixing parameters, such as that $m_c/m_t < m_s/m_b < m_\mu/m_\tau$, or that in the CKM matrix, the elements V_{td}, V_{ub} are much smaller than the others, while in the MNS matrix, the CHOOZ angle θ_{13} is near zero but the SuperK angle θ_{23} is near maximal. Indeed, with only 3 real parameters fitted to $m_c/m_t, m_\mu/m_\tau$ and the Cabbibo angle, one is able to give a reasonable, often near quantitative, description of the fermion mass hierarchy, quark mixing and neutrino oscillation.

The crucial feature of mass matrix rotation in DSM arises from insertions into the fermion propagator of loops of the Higgs states listed in (55). The couplings of these to the fermions can be obtained from the Yukawa coupling term given in (57) and are found also to have the factorized form:

$$\Gamma_K = |v_K\rangle\langle v_0|\frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_5) + |v_0\rangle\langle v_K|\frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma_5), \tag{59}$$

where

$$|v_0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix}; \quad |v_K\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{\tilde{a}} (V_K)^{\tilde{a}}_1 \\ \sum_{\tilde{a}} (V_K)^{\tilde{a}}_2 \\ \sum_{\tilde{a}} (V_K)^{\tilde{a}}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{60}$$

with $(V_K)^{\tilde{a}}_a$ being the coefficient of $\delta\phi^{\tilde{a}}_a$ in the expressions (55) of the Higgs states H_K in terms of the latter variables. With the couplings Γ_K, it is straightforward to calculate the one-Higgs-loop corrections to the fermion mass matrix and then to extract the scale-dependent terms of the vector $\mathbf{r} = (x, y, y)$. One obtains then for $\mathbf{r}$ the RG equation:

$$\frac{d\,\mathbf{r}}{d(\ln \mu^2)} \sim -\sum_K \langle v_0|v_K\rangle |v_K\rangle, \tag{61}$$

which governs the scale dependence of the rotating vector $\mathbf{r}$. One sees that there will be rotation so long as the "governing vector" on the right is neither zero nor parallel to the vector $|v_0\rangle$. Thus, for example, it turns out that the "governing vector" vanishes at $\mathbf{r} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(1, 1, 1)$, but equals $(1, 0, 0)$ when $\mathbf{r}$ itself is at this value, hence the fixed points noted above.

So much then for the old phenomenological model, but what happens with the framon potential of present interest? We note that the so-called "governing vector" for the rotation does not depend on the Higgs masses, only on the Higgs states listed in (55). But as already observed before, the state vectors for $H_K; K = 2, ..., 7$ remain unchanged for the framon potential, which are the only ones to give rise to rotation. The others labelled as $H_K; K = 1, 8, 9$ are changed but remain just a triad of orthonormal linear combinations of the states $h^{\tilde{a}}_a,\ a = 1, 2, 3$. These last all had the matrices V_K appearing in (60) real and diagonal, which means in turn that the vectors $|v_K\rangle$ for $K = 1, 8, 9$ themselves form a real orthonormal triad, from which it then follows that, whether in the framon potential or in V_{DSM}, they will give a contribution to the "governing vector" proportional to $|v_0\rangle$ and can give no rotation. We conclude therefore that despite the differences, the rotational properties obtained before for V_{DSM} still apply to the framon potential, and hence also the good phenomenological results, if interpreted in the same way.

It may thus seem that if in the $su(3)$ theory one adopts the same framon idea as in the previous cases considered, one would end up with a scheme with similar phenomenological achievements as the earlier model DSM constructed specifically for the purpose. This conclusion would be incorrect, however, for several very strong reasons, and one cannot regard this framon scheme yet as anywhere near a realistic description of the stated phenomena. First, in

our analysis of the Higgs spectrum for the framon potential $V[\Phi]$, we have expanded the action about a general point $\zeta(x, y, z)$ in the trough of $V[\Phi]$, but this is not a minimum of the potential as it was for V_{DSM}, of which fact we are reminded of course by the nonvanishing term in (56) linear in the fluctuations, and we have given as yet no justification why one could do so. Secondly, the Yukawa coupling term (57) that we have copied from DSM is only permutation symmetric in the index $\tilde{a}$, not invariant under the global symmetry $\widetilde{su}(3)$ that the framon framework would want. Indeed, given the quantities so far introduced in the scheme, there seems no possibility to construct such an invariant Yukawa term, there being no other vector in $\widetilde{su}(3)$ space to saturate the $\tilde{a}$ indices occurring in $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\tilde{a}}$. Thirdly, if we were to accept the confinement picture of symmetry breaking that is here adopted, the fermions described above are to be considered as compound states of the fundamental fermion fields with the scalar framon fields, i.e. $\bar{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_L\Phi$, confined by $su(3)$ colour, and hence should be interpreted as hadrons, not the near point-like leptons and quarks in which we are interested.

Nevertheless, the similarity of the above framon scheme in the $su(3)$ theory to DSM is indicative and offers us hope that when other relevant features which have not yet been included are taken into account, then a more realistic scheme will emerge. Indeed, in a companion paper [5], it is shown that when applied to chromodynamics, not in isolation but coupled to electroweak theory as it is in nature, then the framon idea gives a much more realistic model with all the above 3 shortcomings removed. Still the treatment here of "chromodynamics" in isolation is instructive as a dry-run, first to test the waters, and secondly to lay the ground work for an attack on the problem in the realistic case.

7 Remarks

In summary, it would seem that the idea of assigning to Higgs fields the geometrical significance of frame vectors in internal symmetry space in the manner suggested is not in contradiction with the use to which Higgs fields are commonly put in particle physics.

On the practical side, it is seen that in the special case of the $u(1) \times su(2)$ theory, the framon idea has led uniquely, modulo only a hypothesis on "minimality" in representation and embedding, to the standard electroweak theory which is the only application so far of the Higgs mechanism to particle physics with definitive success. When applied to chromodynamics, the introduction

of the framon fields, which we stress is in itself not in any contradiction to colour being confined, leads automatically to the existence of a global 3-fold symmetry which can play the role of fermion generations. Although the simplified framework so far examined which takes account only of chromodynamics in isolation is not realistic, it already shows intriguing similarities to an earlier phenomenological model which has had good success in explaining the main features of the fermion generation puzzle, including in particular the fermion mass hierarchy, quark mixing and neutrino oscillations. An attempt to construct with the framon idea a new realistic framework for fermion generations has met with some success and is reported on separately [5].

On the theoretical side, on the other hand, the above considerations lead to some quite revolutionary possibilities. At present, the standard attitude towards Higgs fields is that they are a tool for symmetry breaking. We turn to experiment or rely on some other justifications to decide which of the gauge symmetries that we have started with are to be broken and in what way, and then we introduce into our theory the appropriate Higgs fields to implement the required breaking mechanism. However, if we accept the outlook adopted in the discussion above, it would appear that the scalar fields appearing in a gauge theory have a geometric function of their own to discharge and hence are not to be introduced or discarded at will to suit our interpretation of experiment or some other considerations.

Further, even the concept of whether a gauge symmetry is broken has to be reassessed. As the example in section 3 above has shown, the conventional picture of a local gauge symmetry being spontaneously broken by the introduction of Higgs fields can be given an entirely different, but in actual application completely equivalent, interpretation, namely that the local gauge symmetry is confining, only the global symmetry, necessarily associated with it by virtue of the frame vector interpretation of Higgs fields, can be broken by the process and gives rise to the symmetry breaking phenomenon observed. In other words, if this alternative interpretation of symmetry breaking is adopted, whether a gauge symmetry in a theory is to be broken or not is not up to us to impose but is a matter to be decided by the internal consistency of the theory via the interaction between the gauge vector and "framon" scalar fields. And depending on the structure of the gauge symmetry the physical consequences can be vastly different, as we see in the case of $su(2)$ and $su(3)$.

Finally, pushing the idea to the extreme limit, one could consider the "framon" fields to be part and parcel of a gauge theory without which it may be structurally incomplete. In that case, even the presence of the "framon"

fields would be inherent in the theory, which in turn would decide via its own dynamics which symmetries if any are to be "broken", leaving nothing but the choice of the starting gauge symmetry to be injected from experiment. We do not know whether this last extreme view can be maintained. But in the case of gravity, one has certainly introduced the vierbeins, which are the equivalents of the "framon" scalars here, as independent variables in addition to the spin connections, which are the equivalents of the gauge vector fields. And in the few examples of gauge theories we have chosen to study in this paper, we have not yet come across a blatant contradiction to this extreme viewpoint.

References

[1] P.W. Higgs, Phys. Lett. 12 (1964) 132.

[2] T.W.B. Kibble, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964) 321.

[3] Chan Hong-Mo and Tsou Sheung Tsun, Phys. Rev. D57 (1998) 2507.

[4] Chan Hong-Mo and Tsou Sheung Tsun, Acta Phys. Polonica, 33 (2002) 4041, hep-ph/0303010.

[5] Chan Hong-Mo and Tsou Sheung Tsun, "A Model behind the Standard Model", to appear concurrently with the present paper.

[6] G. 't Hooft, Acta Phys. Austr., Suppl. 22 (1980) 531.

[7] T. Banks and E. Rabinovici, Nucl. Phys. B160 (1979) 347.

[8] G. 't Hooft, Erice lecture notes Aug/Sept 1998, hep-th/9812204 v2 (1999).

[9] See e.g. Chan Hong-Mo and Tsou Sheung Tsun, *Some Elementary Gauge Theory Concepts*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1993, p.11.

[10] José Bordes, Chan Hong-Mo, Jacqueline Faridani, Jakov Pfaudler, and Tsou Sheung Tsun, Phys. Rev. D58, 013004, (1998), hep-ph/9712276.

[11] José Bordes, Chan Hong-Mo and Tsou Sheung Tsun, Eur. Phys. J. C. 10, 63 (1999), hep-ph/9901440.